ZASTROW EXHIBIT 53

Dockets.Justia.com

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

LeMOND CYCLING, INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs. Case No. 08-1010

TREK BICYCLE CORPORATION,

Defendant/Third-Party
Plaintiff,

vs.

GREG LeMOND,

Third-Party Defendant.

Video Deposition of ELISABETH HUBER

Monday, January 5th, 2009

9:33 a.m.

at

GASS WEBER MULLINS, LLC
309 North Water Street, Suite 700
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202

Reported by Julie K. Lyle, RPR/RMR/CRR

Q But even backing up a step, it's available to Trek employees --
A Current Trek employees.
Q -- for personal use?
A Uhm-uhm.
Q In practice, is it used by nonemployees?
A No.
Q What was the rationale for Greg LeMond's use of the employee pricing? Was he considered an employee?
A Pricingwise, yes. But for him, he was considered somebody to be a prominent cycling figure and that he had contacts in the media, and he was allowed to go beyond the normal employee limitations because he wanted to get out and sell his bike line. And we also wanted to keep him and his family on the most current year product.
Q Is there anybody else, to your knowledge, at Trek who had that right?
A I have no knowledge since I've not worked with anybody else except Greg LeMond.
Q So you don't know if other prominent cyclists with whom Trek has a relationship, for example, Gary Fisher, if he has the ability to avail himself of employee pricing?

Q Since -- from 2000, it looks like, or from --
A 1999.
Q -- 1999 through 2008.
So was this purchase on -- at the very last page of Trek 006617, were these final purchases, to your knowledge, the last purchases that Mr. LeMond was allowed to make under his employee purchase?
A This is anything that's been invoiced, yes.
Q Okay. Would there be a reason why the very last item is missing an invoice number?
A It may not have invoiced by the time I made this.
Q Okay.
A It usually is an overnight process.
MS. RAHNE: Okay. I don't have anything else, unless you have something, Ralph.
MR. WEBER: One follow-up.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. WEBER:
Q Ms. Huber, you described that as part of your preparation for today you read the morning session of Mr. LeMond's deposition where he described bike -- his transactions with bikes. Is that right?
A That's correct.

Q And can you tell me, when you read his deposition, having worked with him over a number of years, was what you saw him talk about, was it consistent or inconsistent with your understanding of -- of his rights under the employee purchase program?

MS. RAHNE: Object to the form. That's vague as to what you're referencing.

MR. WEBER: You can answer.

MS. RAHNE: You can totally answer.

THE WITNESS: Okay. I felt it was inconsistent.

BY MR. WEBER:

Q And why is that?

A Because going back and looking also at the e-mails that were provided by his counsel, and what he was using this for wasn't what I thought it was for and what I thought it should be for. And that my understanding of this purchase program was to further his bike line, and I didn't feel that it did that in any way, shape, or form.

MR. WEBER: That's all I have. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

MS. RAHNE: Can I do one follow-up, please?

EXAMINATION

BY MS. RAHNE:

Q Can you be more specific about what you saw that changed your opinion?

A Specifically, one e-mail was to, I believe, Chris Wright saying I'm opening up the employee purchase to anybody, you know, any friends and family, and I would have thought that he would want to support the dealer base and have people like that going into dealerships to purchase his product instead of offering it at a discounted price.

Q And you saw that somehow as different than what had been happening all of the years previously when he was selling large volumes of bikes -- getting -- getting large volumes of bikes through his employee discount?

A Yes.

Q And why was that?

A Because it was my understanding that it was media people, it was teams. That's who I saw -- he said in his explanations to me, this is for my dad, this is for my son, this is for my great friend. So to have him say it to somebody that -- like "tell anybody you want" was surprising.

Q And you believe that there was an explanation provided to you for all of the orders that were put through previous to the one that you're referencing, which I'm assuming was recent?

A Not -- not all but a lot.

Q Okay.

A And oftentimes we would have a prior conversation on the phone, or maybe he would call in and say, "Hey, I want to get this bike for my buddy. Is it in stock?"

"Yes, it is."

"Great, I'll send you the e-mail."

And two days later in would come the e-mail with the address to ship.

VIDEO TECHNICIAN: No further questions?

There being no further questions, that concludes the deposition of Elisabeth Huber. We're off the record of at the end of Videotape No. 3 at 1:30 p.m.

(Deposition concluded at 1:30 p.m.)

(Original exhibits attached to original